



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/558,567	04/26/2000	Douglas E. Meisner	07844-374001	9484

21876 7590 04/23/2004
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3300 DAIN RAUSCHER PLAZA
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MT

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/558,567

Applicant(s)

MEISNER ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28, 34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 2/6/2004, application filed on 04/26/2000.
2. Claims 1-28 and 34-35 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 15, 34, and 35 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (hereafter referred to as Brown), US 5,627,959 issued 5/6/1997 in view of Cook et al. (hereafter referred to as Cook), US 6,178,432 B1 filed 9/30/1996.**

Regarding independent claims 1 and 15, Brown teaches receiving as an input a selection identifying a trigger event in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches receiving as an input base visual content in col. 2 lines 58-60. Brown teaches grouping graphic objects with allowance for multi-level groups in fig. 1-3 and col. 6 lines 27-34. Brown teaches automatically generating visual content from the base visual content, each region of the viewing visual content having a corresponding region in the base visual content in fig. 9-11, the abstract, and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4. Brown teaches automatically identifying a set of regions in which swap visual content is to be displayed later by a viewing application in place of viewing visual content

Art Unit: 2176

when a trigger event occurs during execution of the viewing application in col. 3 lines 1-28.

Brown teaches automatically generating swap visual content in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Brown does not explicitly teach intermediate visual content, but the multi-level graphics grouping could be used as intermediate visual content. Furthermore, Cook teaches combining multiple content objects triggered by events to create interactive web page content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Cook also teaches automatically generating visual content from the base visual content, each region of the viewing visual content having a corresponding region in the base visual content and each region of the intermediate visual content having a corresponding region in the viewing visual content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Cook also teaches automatically identifying a set of regions in which swap visual content is to be displayed later by a viewing application in place of viewing visual content when a trigger event occurs during execution of the viewing application in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches automatically generating visual content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the multi-level graphics grouping taught by Brown and the multi-object interactive web page content taught by Cook to have implemented intermediate visual content to have generated swap visual content. It would have been obvious and desirable to have classified some of the objects as intermediate content object to have created dynamic visual content which could have been used to have created dynamic portions of a web page in response to user trigger

Art Unit: 2176

events in addition to static portions of the web page. The intermediate content object combined with the base visual content would have allowed the user to have implemented an interactive page which would have changed content in certain areas of the page in response to user initiated trigger events. Cook provides motivation to create a dynamic web page in response to user initiated trigger events in col. 2 lines 10-58.

Regarding independent claim 29, Brown teaches receiving as an input a selection of a trigger event in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches receiving as an input a selection of a trigger region of interactive visual content associated with a trigger event in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4. Brown teaches grouping graphic objects with allowance for multi-level groups in fig. 1-3 and col. 6 lines 27-34. Brown teaches automatically identifying a set of swap regions of the interactive visual content in which swap visual content is to be displayed by the viewing application when the trigger event occurs to the trigger region in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches automatically generating visual content in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Brown does not explicitly teach intermediate visual content, but the multi-level graphics grouping could be used as intermediate visual content. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the multi-level graphics grouping taught by Brown as intermediate visual content to generate swap visual content. It would have been obvious and desirable to classify some of the group object as intermediate content to create dynamic visual content which could have been easily organized, maintained, and modified.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 16, Brown teaches generating instructions operable to cause a computer executing a viewing application to display swap visual content in identified set of regions when a trigger event occurs in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Regarding dependent claims 3 and 17, Brown teaches generating interactive visual content, the interactive visual content comprising the viewing visual content and the swap visual content in fig. 9-11, the abstract, and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 18, Brown teaches a trigger event associated with base visual content in col. 3 lines 1-28.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 19, Brown teaches providing a content division structure that divides the viewing visual content into a plurality of sections in fig. 1-3. Brown teaches automatically identifying sections of visual content in which swap visual content is to be displayed by a viewing application when a trigger event occurs in col. 4 lines 6-19.

Regarding dependent claims 6 and 20, Brown teaches providing a content division structure that divides the viewing visual content into a plurality of sections, and wherein each section of the viewing visual content has a corresponding section in the base visual content in fig. 1-3 and col. 6 lines 27-34.

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 21, Brown teaches generating a viewing image file for each section of viewing visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34.

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 22, Brown teaches visual content including a plurality of sections, each section of the visual content having a corresponding section of base visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claims 9 and 23, Brown teaches determining, for each section of visual content, if the corresponding section of base visual content visually differs from that section of the intermediate visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34. The procedure associated with the graphical object could have been used to have determined how graphical object compared to another graphical object.

Regarding dependent claims 10 and 24, Brown teaches a pixel-by-pixel comparison is performed in order to determine, for each section of the visual content, if the corresponding section of the base visual content visually differs from that section of the visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34.

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 25, Brown teaches calculating an intermediate checksum for a section of visual content, calculating a base checksum for the corresponding section of base visual content, and if the intermediate checksum differs from the base checksum, identifying the section of the viewing visual content associated with that section of the visual content as a section in which swap visual content is to be displayed by the viewing application when a trigger event occurs in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 26, Brown teaches generating, for each section of visual content that visually differs from the corresponding section of base visual content, a swap image file derived from that section of the visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34.

Regarding dependent claims 13 and 27, Brown teaches providing a content division structure that divides the viewing visual content into a plurality of sections and generating

Art Unit: 2176

instructions operable to cause a computer executing the viewing application to display sections of viewing visual content in a table in fig. 1-3 and col. 4 lines 6-19.

Regarding dependent claims 14 and 28, Brown teaches providing a user interface enabling a designer to edit intermediate visual content as an integral unit in col. 5 lines 1-17.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Brown teaches generating instructions operable to cause a computer executing a viewing application to display swap visual content in identified regions when a trigger event occurs in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Brown teaches receiving as an input base visual content in col. 2 lines 58-60. Brown teaches automatically generating viewing visual content from the base visual content for display by a viewing application in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Brown teaches a trigger event associated with base visual content in col. 3 lines 1-28.

Regarding dependent claim 33, Brown teaches providing a content division structure that divides the viewing visual content into a plurality of sections in fig. 1-3. Brown teaches automatically identifying sections of visual content in which swap visual content is to be displayed by a viewing application when a trigger event occurs in col. 4 lines 6-19.

Regarding independent claim 34, Brown teaches receiving as an input a selection identifying a rollover event in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches receiving as an input base visual content in col. 2 lines 58-60. Brown teaches generating viewing visual content from the base content for display by a viewing application in fig. 9-11, the abstract, and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4. Brown teaches providing a content division structure that divides the viewing content

Art Unit: 2176

for display by a viewing application in fig. 1-3 and col. 2 line 32 – col. 3 line 28. Brown teaches generating a viewing image file for each section of viewing visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34. Brown teaches determining, for each section of the visual content, if the corresponding section of the base visual content visually differs from that section of the visual content in fig. 1-3, col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, and col. 6 lines 27-34. Brown teaches automatically generating swap visual content in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Brown does not explicitly teach intermediate visual content, but the multi-level graphics grouping could be used as intermediate visual content. Furthermore, Cook teaches combining multiple content objects triggered by events to create interactive web page content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Cook also teaches generating viewing visual content from the base content for display by a viewing application in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Cook also teaches automatically identifying a set of regions in which swap visual content is to be displayed later by a viewing application in place of viewing visual content when a trigger event occurs during execution of the viewing application in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches automatically generating visual content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Brown does not teach copying the base visual content to intermediate visual content. Cook teaches a multi-object interactive web page including authoring software for manipulating it which would have allowed receiving input edits to the intermediate visual content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the multi-level graphics grouping taught by Brown and the multi-object interactive web page content taught by Cook to have implemented intermediate visual content to have generated swap visual content. It would have been obvious and desirable to have classified some of the objects as intermediate content object to have created dynamic visual content which could have been used to have created dynamic portions of a web page in response to user trigger events in addition to static portions of the web page. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used Cook to have copied the base visual content to intermediate visual content to have received input edits to the intermediate visual content. The intermediate content object combined with the base visual content would have allowed the user to have implemented an interactive page which would have changed content in certain areas of the page in response to user initiated trigger events. Cook provides motivation to create a dynamic web page in response to user initiated trigger events in col. 2 lines 10-58.

Regarding independent claim 35, Brown teaches receiving as an input base visual content in col. 2 lines 58-60. Brown teaches automatically generating visual content from the base visual content, each region of the viewing visual content having a corresponding region in the base visual content in fig. 9-11, the abstract, and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4. Brown teaches automatically identifying a set of regions in which swap visual content is to be displayed by a viewing application in place of viewing visual content when a trigger event occurs during execution of the viewing application in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches automatically generating swap visual content in fig. 9-11 and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4. Brown teaches

Art Unit: 2176

generating interactive visual content, the interactive visual content comprising the viewing visual content and the swap visual content in fig. 9-11, the abstract, and col. 13 line 21 – col. 15 line 4.

Brown does not explicitly teach intermediate visual content, but the multi-level graphics grouping could be used as intermediate visual content. Furthermore, Cook teaches combining multiple content objects triggered by events to create interactive web page content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Cook also teaches generating viewing visual content from the base content for display by a viewing application in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Cook also teaches automatically identifying a set of regions in which swap visual content is to be displayed later by a viewing application in place of viewing visual content when a trigger event occurs during execution of the viewing application in col. 3 lines 1-28. Brown teaches automatically generating visual content in fig. 1-2, the abstract, col. 2 line 34 – col. 3 line 42, and col. 4 line 39 – col. 6 line 45. Brown does not teach copying the base visual content to intermediate visual content. Cook teaches a multi-object interactive web page including authoring software for manipulating it which would have allowed receiving input edits to the intermediate visual content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the multi-level graphics grouping taught by Brown and the multi-object interactive web page content taught by Cook to have implemented intermediate visual content to have generated swap visual content. It would have been obvious and desirable to have classified some of the objects as intermediate content object to have created dynamic visual content which could have been used to have created dynamic portions of a web page in response to user trigger

Art Unit: 2176

events in addition to static portions of the web page. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used Cook to have copied the base visual content to intermediate visual content to have received input edits to the intermediate visual content. The intermediate content object combined with the base visual content would have allowed the user to have implemented an interactive page which would have changed content in certain areas of the page in response to user initiated trigger events. Cook provides motivation to create a dynamic web page in response to user initiated trigger events in col. 2 lines 10-58.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument on pages 11 and 12 that Brown does not teach identifying regions in which swap visual content is to be displayed, the Examiner notes that Brown teaches in the cited section of col. 3 lines 1-28 that a customized procedure for opening a or closing a graphical display may be invoked by a trigger event such as a mouse event including a mouse button down, a mouse move with a button down, a mouse move with no button down, or a mouse button up. The customized procedure initiates a change in a graphical display which the Examiner interprets as substituting the display of swap visual content in place of visual viewing content. The Examiner believes the cited passage continues to read upon the more explicit claim limitation.

Regarding Applicant's argument on page 12 and 13 that the amended claim 1 has the limitation that each region of the viewing visual content has a corresponding region in the base visual content and that each region of the intermediate visual content has a corresponding region

Art Unit: 2176

in the viewing visual content. The Examiner has additionally introduced the reference of Cook which teaches a web page including both static regions and dynamic regions, the dynamic regions exhibiting graphical display changes, the changes being initiated by user trigger events. The Examiner believes Cook teaches the claimed relationships of the base, intermediate, and viewing visual contents.

Regarding Applicant's argument on pages 13 and 14 that Brown fails to teach generating a viewing image file or generating a swap image file, the Examiner believes the cited passage of col. 5 line 60 – col. 6 line 17, reproduced by Applicant, is a description of the graphical objects created and used by the invention disclosed by Brown. The graphical objects each contain a name, an event type, and a procedure. The Examiner believes the graphical objects of Brown are viewing image files. The event type and procedure associated with the graphical object determines what kind of object it is. The functionality of the object could cause it to appear on the user display in response to an event, thus qualifying it as a swap image file.

Regarding Applicant's argument on page 14 that Brown does not teach determining if the corresponding section of base visual content visually differs from that section of the intermediate visual content, the Examiner believes the procedure associated with the graphical object could have been used to have determined how graphical object compared to another graphical object.

Regarding Applicant's argument on page 14 that Brown does not teach providing an user interface enabling a designer to edit intermediate visual content as an integral unit, the Examiner notes that the graphical objects of Brown may be edited and that the intermediate visual content is established in the independent claim via obviousness.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gennaro et al., US 5,742,768 patented 4/21/1998 discloses providing and displaying a web page having an embedded menu. The menu is displayed in response to a user initiated mouse trigger event. Guedalia, US 6,121,970 filed 11/26/1997 discloses enabling a user to interactive view a digital image on an HTML page. The invention divides an HTML page into a variety of sub-regions and determines which sub-region the user on the client computer selects.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
4/19/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER